R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 014 306 JC 670 956

CLIMATES OF LEARNING AND THE INNOVATIVE PROCESS, WORKSHOP CONFERENCES TO FOSTER INNOVATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION (4TH, SHIMER COLLEGE, MT. CARROLL, ILLINOIS, AND CHESTNUT MOUNTAIN LODGE, GALENA, ILLINOIS, APRIL 26-29, 1967).

BY- PORTER, LAWRENCE C.
UNION FOR RES. AND EXPERIMENTATION IN HIGHER EDUC.

REPORT NUMBER BR-6-2183-4 PUB DATE. 67
CONTRACT OEC-3-6-062183-0667
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$2.44 59P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *HIGHER EDUCATION, *INNOVATION, EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT, ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION, COLLEGE FACULTY, STUDENT TEACHER RELATIONSHIP, STUDENT COLLEGE RELATIONSHIP, STUDENT REACTION, EDUCATIONAL STRATEGIES,

SPEAKERS AT THE CONFERENCE DISCUSSED (1) "INCLUSIVE" INNOVATION, WHICH MUST PROVIDE FOR BOTH THE ESSENTIALIST AND THE EXISTENTIALIST, (2) MEANS BY WHICH, IN THE CLIMATE OF URBANIZATION AND DEMOCRATIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND OF A NATIONAL (AS OPPOSED TO REGIONAL OR SECULAR) CULTURE, FACULTIES BECOME MORE CONSERVATIVE AND STUDENTS LESS AUTONOMOUS, (3) A NEW ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE, IN WHICH THE TRADITIONAL PYRAMIDAL FORM AND POSITIONAL AUTHORITY ARE REPLACED BY SITUATIONAL AUTHORITY, (4) FACULTY AND STUDENT VARIABLES IN THREE DIFFERENT CLIMATES OF LEARNING--A COMPREHENSIVE ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE, A TRIMESTER PROGRAM INVOLVING A WELL-DEFINED CORE CURRICULUM AND ABSENCE OF GRADING, AND A SERIES OF "EXPECTED EXPERIENCES", (5) A COMPARISON OF THE REACTIONS OF TWO CLASSES, GRADUATES OF 1959 AND 1964, AT MONTEITH COLLEGE TO THEIR INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS AND TEACHERS IN AN EFFORT TO DETERMINE THE HIGHLIGHTS OF THEIR CAMPUS EXPERIENCES, (6) CHANGES IN TEACHING STRATEGIES AND EVALUATION TO GIVE STUDENTS A SUCCESSFUL LEARNING EXPERIENCE, (7) MEANS BY WHICH THE UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO MIGHT PRESERVE THE CONTEMPLATIVE, CLASSICAL TRADITION IN CONTRAST TO A GROWING PRAGMATIC PROFESSIONALISM, WHILE RETAINING ITS CURRENT DEVELOPMENT OF NEW SUBJECT MATTERS AND STYLES OF TEACHING, AND (8) THE INCREASING PREVALENCE OF EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION, TO THE POSSIBLE DETRIMENT OF THE LIBERAL ARTS. (HH)

4

climates of learning and the innovative process

CLIMATES OF LEARNING AND THE INNOVATIVE PROCESS

The Fourth Conference on Innovation, held April 26-29, 1967, at Shimer College, Mt. Carroll, Illinois, and Chestnut Mountain Lodge, Galena, Illinois, under the auspices of the Union for Research and Experimentation in Higher Education, in cooperation with the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, the University of California, Berkeley

Reported and Edited by
Lawrence C. Porter,
Antioch College and
UREHE.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EDITOR'S NOTE

The addresses, panel discussions, and workshops herein reported have been edited in what might be called "third-person summary" form, to present a relatively brief account of the proceedings while retaining some of their flavor through the inclusion of direct quotation.

Full versions of any of these documents may be obtained by writing Dr. Samuel Baskin, President, Union for Research and Experimentation in Higher Education, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio, 45387.

INTRODUCTION

This last in a series of four Workshop Conferences to Foster Innovation in Higher Education was marked by a fruitful air of relaxation, in the midst of which--during the numerous hours not dedicated to addresses or workshop sessions--conferees came together, in twos and threes and larger groups, to talk about the conference, about their own schools, their own endeavors, their own concerns. This informal atmosphere seems to have been characteristic of the conference as a whole, and quite probably added an important dimension to what happened there.

In part this may have been due to the dedication of the conference coordinator, Dr. Patricia Cross, whose efforts I take this occasion to applaud; in part it may have been due to the great sweep of the Mississippi, always visible through the lodge's windows; in part it may have been due to the degree to which faculty and students "opened up" more than they are wont to do with each other; and part of the credit must also go to a group of speakers who provided ideas, insights, stimulation--who brought with them their own enthusiasm.

It is the hope of the Union that the four conferences have served well the some four hundred people who attended them. But further, it is our hope that the reports which have issued from the meetings will provide many others with incisive statements of the significant issues and vital questions which confront American higher education today.

--Samuel Baskin, President
Union for Research and
Experimentation
in Higher Education

INCLUSIVE INNOVATION

Warren Bryan Martin

Dr. Martin opened by stating his belief that the most significant development in higher education in the last two decades is not such things as use of computers, federal funding and influence, consortia, or growth in numbers; "the development of greatest consequence . . . has been in the realm of the mind and the spirit, and has to do with ideas and personalities--it is the essentialist-existentialist confrontation," and it is what we decide about this that will determine what is done with the other developments. As an example of this confrontation (which, Martin said, is found in many areas of modern life) he cited Paul Rudolph's "environmental architecture" in the design of Yale's School of Art and Architecture, which is designed not merely in terms of physical efficiency, but responding to "the fact that art should stimulate the emotions as well as the mind." Here we have the issue central to the essentialist-existentialist confrontation: "the formal versus the vital."

Martin then described the essentialist position (held by such men as Wittgenstein, Dewey, James, Locke, Descartes, Aquinas, Augustine, Aristotle, Plato) as concerned "for that which goes beyond time and place; for that which is permanent, uniform, rational, sure," with a standard of judgment - God, nature, humanity, etc. - but never "that solitary being--man." On the other hand, the existentialists (including such men as Buber, Heidegger, Sartre, Camus--with such antecedents as Kierkegaard, Pascal, Rousseau, Augustine [who has "a foot in each camp"], Socrates, Job)--focus on man as man, and "see philosophy and education as efforts to give rational form to a vision that must be, finally, intensely personal." An example of the confrontation in practice is Augustine, who in one work (The City of God) was "bent on reconciling the world of men with that of God," while in another (Confessions) he was "a man confronted by God, a human being who could tremble as well as testify."

For many existentialists, man "creates all meanings," and for all of them meaning is of great importance. This seems very much to be the concern of today's young people, who have not (as McLuhan says) "been flipped by an electric switch," but have been affected by "a panexistential ethos" which challenges them to look inward, to feel intensely, and "to insist on meanings in life that are personal and vital."

This is not to say, Martin warned, that the confrontation is between "people this side or that side of age thirty." Instead, on one side are the essentialists, who are concerned with "subject matter and standards, prerequisites and sequences," who "emphasize the disciplines and protect the departmental style of life." For the essentialists, continuity is more important than immediacy, and academic freedom is likely to be "a matter of conceptual entities--definitions, mechanisms for implementation, penalties for violations."

The existentialist sees Western man as moving toward greater personal autonomy. The stripping away of formal structures and "traditional consolations" that has been a part of this movement creates a thrilling but terrifying freedom, in the midst of which man must develop a tolerance for ambiguity. The existentialist, therefore, is more concerned with "present and personal relevance" than with continuity with the past.

There is a "new existentialism," Martin noted, which breaks with the dark mood of such men as Kierkegaard and Heidegger and emphasizes "the full range of human experiences from which meanings are derived--disorder and order, mystery and certitudes, frailty and aspiration, grief and joy." It wishes to avoid models fixed by history, without ignoring history, and therefore "emphasize that knowing and valuing are both facets of the learning experience." It stresses the affective more than the cumulative.

This confrontation must have an effect on the innovative process. Today, Martin said, the essentialists dominate the climate of learning, though the existentialists "keep throwing open

windows to let in fresh air." Both sides are interested in innovation--the essentialists largely concerned with "new means to traditional ends," the existentialists with "new means to new ends." But with the essentialists in control, it could be predicted that those changes having the best chance for success would be: 1) those "that show good innovation-system congruence," as at Justin Morrill College at Michigan State University, where "complementarity, not confrontation, is the rule;" 2) those espoused by the innovator who is a "good fellow"--courteous, patient, etc.--with "good credentials;" a "team man, . . . who blends into the woodwork." ("We may free him to experiment. And we need not fear the results.") Such "congruence" and "compatability" are desired by essentialists because their values dictate that tradition must control experimentation.

Given a different set of values, the existentialists will seek changes which "free the individual from the dominance of the institution," which "break open the conventional packaging of knowledge."

Martin asserted that "professors in increasing numbers are bored," that they teach perfunctorily because they are not motivated to do better. Increased concern with specialization leads the professor to a subject-matter level where he must sacrifice either the student's comprehension of the material or his own interest in it. For this reason, existentialists move toward more flexible programs (e.g., trans- or cross-disciplinary) which will bring faculty "out to the borders of their disciplines," and toward ways of propelling "the free individual into social and political situations." Their proposals are likely to be "more radical in content and less predictable in style," sometime ignorant of how organizations function, sometimes impatient, sometimes both--producing "a bastard who becomes hysterical because he thinks that he has no legitimate connection with the past, or a messianic, who thinks that the salvation of the world rests with him alone."

What we need, Martin said, "are innovators who think inclusively about the prospects for inclusive innovations." That is, they must

be able to recognize the strengths of both sides (essentialist and existentialist) and make use of them to reach their goals, and they must see things from the other person's viewpoint without losing their own. Those who think there is no reason to change must be shown the considerable reasons which exist; those who think that the Establishment makes change impossible must be shown that change can and does occur (e.g., changes following Sputnik, or those in more recent years at Berkeley). The "inclusive innovator" must also have "an appreciation for the dynamics of change in complex organizations," a recognition of the factors necessary to innovation (including such things as a motivating and unifying ideology, strong leadership, provision for self-renewal and critical analysis).

This kind of innovator must form "inclusive innovations," which avoid patching and pasting, which do not set a small area of freedom into a large area of formal structure which is likely to render that freedom inoperable. Piecemeal innovation may be better than none, Martin said, but it would seem that today radical change is called for--inclusive innovation, which takes into account <u>all</u> elements of the teaching-learning environment.

THE FACULTY AND INSTITUTIONAL CLIMATE

Joseph Gusfield

The speaker began by saying that he was going to take a look at the "system" within which faculty function and against which problems of innovation occur, with emphasis on "the enormous innovation in the whole construction of higher education involved by the great increase in numbers of people in the varying social levels who are going to colleges and universities in the United States." These two factors--numbers and wide range of social level--make it clear that we are no longer talking about elite education, but about popular, mass education, and this is central to the issues discussed in this address.

Gusfield then noted that we now live in an affluent, technological society, which seems to be producing a "mass aristocracy," and suggested that the mass movement into colleges must lead us to ask, "What are the goals or aims around which this increase in numbers may make sense, may affect our culture?" We must wonder as we face educating all levels of social class in a structure which is traditionally elitist--"Education for what?"

He then dealt with four things--having implications for innovation--occurring to American faculty:

1. The democratization of higher education--leading to questions of who shall be educated? is education a national utility or function? should it be geared to the demand for college graduates or conceived of in terms of what individuals want? The faculty in their teaching and their innovations take stances toward these questions, the extremes of which are an elitist orientation and a popular or mass orientation. As larger numbers come in, the colleges less and less assume the "socializing" function--teaching the "correct" grammar, the "right" vocabulary, etc.--so as to enable students to occupy a particular social niche.

Complementary to this is the enormous growth of public education--perceived in the growing belief that "public education is where the action is"--where the innovation is occurring, where most of the students are being taught, "where increasingly the tone of the system is itself set." This raises public questions of the function of higher education, and faculty must deal with questions such as the extent to which higher education is valued in terms of the good it does for the total society or in terms of the degree to which it develops "a more humane, a more intelligent, a more artistic kind of populace."

This democratization affects the small colleges greatly because of the competition for students and faculty, which is powerfully influenced by the public market. It also confronts them with questions having to do with their self-image: for example, to what extent and in what ways are they unique?

2. The urbanization of higher education: where colleges once were in rural settings, now more and more they are to be found in major cities--making for an enormous shift in the constituency of higher education. This leads to different demands on the schools and also makes them much more "visible." They are more under public scrutiny in large cities, which means they are more likely to find research (say on segregation) controversial and are more likely to find people (often themselves not having attended college) wanting greater attention paid to teaching. In addition to bringing the populace more fully into the process of education, commuter campuses (though not only these) are a central element in the decline of autonomy among students, since commuter students--who go to classes and then go home--have difficulty forming "a culture in which they have values, rules, and ties to each other of some degree of importance and concern." This sets a problem for faculty: to what extent will they play a part in shaping those cultures?

3. The specialization of the faculty: there is a shift away from the conception of college faculty as teachers to the conception of them as scholars and intellectuals--the Ph.D. syndrome. This is important because it affects the idea that the faculty might play a role in the socialization of the student. More and more perceiving himself as a member

of a cultural elite, the professor more and more sees a gap between his authority and knowledge and that of the populace. Indeed, the faculty now wields considerable power in "setting the internal mechanisms of values by which academic people tend to live."

With respect to the democratic revolution, this faculty power leads to three kinds of educational orientation concerning innovation, change, etc: a) the orientation which asks for more expertise, an educational structure which produces, in terms of the needs of the economy, "better experts, more experts, faster experts." b) an elitist orientation which seeks to reward talent in terms of liberal arts concerns and of "the preservation of the college in its old forms." c) mass orientation, which seeks answers based on the fact of increased numbers and more varied social levels of incoming students. This divides into a "selection" orientation (bring in a lot, but throw out those who don't meet the standards) or an orientation which gears education towards most of the students. ("Shall the motto be 'They shall not pass?' or shall it be 'A college for everyone, everyone for a college'?")

4. The nationalization of the academic, in many ways the most important trend, a function in part of the nationalization of our culture (Gusfield pointed out the nationalization that has taken place, for example, in the standardized pronunciation of radio and TV announcers). It occurs because of graduate training, which makes him a member of a national society, because of research funds which make universities less dependent on, and therefore less "flavored" by their local constituents. Small colleges are involved also; some are beginning to cut away denominational ties, to become less sectarian and more cosmopolitan--which will lead to innovation designed to show that the college is unique "in what it does rather than who it does it for or who it does it to."

In terms of faculty and of innovation, Gusfield saw the implications of these four trends as:

1. Greater autonomy and consequently greater conservatism among faculty.

2. Decline of the autonomy of student cultures--"what faculty can do to students without fear of reprisal, without great fears of unpopularity, tends to increase," and the idea of professional standards

increases the rigor with which faculty may treat students and also the dissatisfaction they may find in teaching the average student. Because of this loss of power, students find it necessary to use "fundamentally political mechanisms" to gain some measure of control, and this pressure is likely to produce innovation. Indeed, the ideology of change in higher education seems to come more from students than from administrators and more from administrators than from faculty.

These two factors operate at the heart of the issue, and they operate counter to one another. Student pressures--of both numbers and desires--force the increasingly departmentalized and elitist professors into counter-revolutionary actions.

Some good has come out of it all, however, for the increase in higher education has led to a more humane population, and much of this is due to "the conflict between more cosmopolitanized faculty, more nationally oriented faculty, less localized faculty who can bring to students the tendencies, the trends that go on at levels of culture stemming from national centers, but who at the same time will find themselves increasingly having to face the difficult problems of the popularizing of education."

STRUCTURE AND CLIMATE--A NEW VIEW

Harold L. Hodgkinson

Dr. Hodgkinson opened by noting that in mid-19th century America, college students had operated "directly in conflict with the wishes of rather ineffectual faculty and administration leadership," in this manner establishing the fraternity system, the gymnasium movement, and (more academically), the literary guild. (In the last instance, the fact that their book collections were often superior to those of the college libraries forced faculties into new approaches in their courses.) Following this period, the more highly structured and specialized Germanic model was adopted, giving faculty much greater control. During this time there were many instances of great college presidents, but often they were attacked by the faculty in a struggle for power.

Since the turn of the century, Hodgkinson said, faculty and administration "have build enormous and imposing bureaucratic structures, while the students have not (and could not, due to their short stay)." In the early 1920's Yale students objected to the depersonalization they found at their school, and wondered--given the availability of books--about the justification for lectures.

It would seem, Hodgkinson said, that "like rings on a tree, the structure of governance of a college or university is its living history, generally inappropriate for the present as it is an agglutination of the past." We live in a strange time, in which 300 college presidencies are vacant and many of the best candidates are refusing such openings; in which deans are going back into teaching; in short, a time in which it would seem that there is "a genuine dissatisfaction with the systems of higher education on the part of responsible adults," a more meaningful criticism than that indicated by student riots, which are often concerned with food service or social regulations. To see what is going on, we must turn to organizational theory.

Max Weber, a great organizational analyst, saw bureaucracy as a hierarchy of positions (not people), a vertical pyramid, "with power, communication, and activity very highly structured up and down," and little concern for the personal needs, emotions, and goals of those within it. Now, however, social science has indicated that allowing workers to be people can increase productivity, and most businesses now are concerned with human relations. This has not yet happened in education, "but the signs of the managerial revolution" are clear there also, and college presidents who see themselves sitting on top of a vast, stable power pyramid are, in Hodgkinson's opinion, "the last of the dinossaurs."

Another significant hypothesis is that of Bennis and Likert, that "decisions (made by the work group itself) are made at the most relevant point of the organizational social space, where the most data are available." This idea represents the end of the positions idea in bureaucracy. What is needed to replace it is a system "that is situation and problem centered," and that establishes relationships between persons on a horizontal rather than vertical basis. There are no permanent superiors and permanent subordinates; roles are determined by the context.

Such a model, Hodgkinson stated, is operative in no college that he knows of, but students perceive (albeit dimly perhaps) "that the organizational goals of personal growth are antithetical to the organizational structures which are supposed to implement them." So too with faculty, who find fulfillment not in local institutional loyalties, but in learned societies. The administrator, however, has considerable investment in the organization structure and because of this is often bogged down in making essentially petty decisions.

Colleges operate on the basis of competition rather than collaboration, with people "working their way up" in rank, in honor-point average, etc. On the other hand, the model Hodgkinson proposes provides opportunity for people to bargain honestly and speak truthfully, instead of providing various power-structures for various campus segments to protect, take over, or (often with students) circumvent. The student-

initiated "free university" concept is close to Hodgkinson's model, for in the free university, students and faculty collaborate, with competition a minor concern. Reports suggest that this leads to a great increase of honesty between persons.

An organization built on his model, Hodgkinson believes, would have situational (rather than heirarchical) leadership--which would eliminate the "standard teaching load" because professors would come to be known not only for their mastery of content, but also for the various ways by which they best communicated it--enabling them to function methodologically in ways most rewarding to them and to students. The administrator would no longer have to carry a multiplicity of roles, but could "make" the best use of each man in each situation," creating an administrative team, with communication on grounds of skill and competence, not position.

In such a non-status structure, the students would be able to perform many instructional roles (say in interdisciplinary teaching and research, where they often are in better positions than many faculty members). Here Hodgkinson referred to the idea of a research team, faculty and students on it being "equal in interest without being identical in competence."

To implement such a scheme Hodgkinson emphasized the need to establish new colleges (designed by planning teams) which might provide interest and motivation for established institutions. The model has implications not only for undergraduate education, but also for graduate schools. And it leads us to questions: "In a democracy which is also a technocracy, who decides who decides? "Will situational leadership have sufficient rewards?" "What is the nature of the changing educational environment?" "Must we adapt to all social change?" "Can we be collaborative in our personal encounters and still serve the selective function which our society has thrust upon educational institutions?"

FACULTY AND STUDENT VARIABLES IN THREE DIFFERENT CLIMATES OF LEARNING

Mildred Henry*

Dr. Henry began by pointing out that her interest (and that of her colleagues) in student and faculty variables in climates of learning was stimulated by earlier studies which had claimed that "the high productivity of scholars from a very distinctive group of colleges was due more or less to a very unusual intellectual climate that seemed to exist in these places." This was questioned by another group of researchers who believed it was not the intellectual climate so much as "student input" that made the difference. Still further studies indicated that these schools were getting considerably more than their share of merit scholars and that their students had "special personality characteristics" as well. The Jacobs study then indicated that the colleges seemed to have no impact, which caused much concern.

Next, Dr. Henry cited The Academic Mind to the effect that faculty members of a more liberal and permissive inclination were more likely to go to what would be characterized as the more distinctive colleges and universities. Further, that at such schools the administrators solidly backed the concept of academic freedom. Apparently certain kinds of institutions attract certain kinds of people.

Dr. Henry then moved to the criteria which distinguish the unusual and distinctive colleges and universities, listing them and dilating on them. Among these are setting, a favorable proportion of interested students and of interested, knowledgeable professors (both research and teaching oriented), communication between students and faculty, creative leadership, democratic modes of operation, clearly articulated values, a curricular structure which is consonant with those values, and "an acceptable degree of general psychological tension, intellectual ferment, and socio-political concern introduced by teachers, students, administrators."

---

*A report of research done in collaboration with Paul A. Heist.

The speaker then moved on to a comparison of the three subject schools--Shimer, Raymond, and Northeastern Illinois State (formerly Illinois Teachers, Chicago-North)--all three of which are in one or another of the Center studies. The first two could be described as "sort of far-out colleges in conservative settings," while N.I.S. is in a fairly conservative residential area that is also fairly conservative. Each school claims to offer a different kind of learning environment, each is concerned with giving a liberal arts education.

According to their catalogues, Shimer "provides a unique welding of general courses, comprehensives and examinations and so on into a complete academic experience;" Raymond has a core curriculum--a set of well-defined courses, but no grading; Northeastern Illinois does not mention specific courses in its catalogue, instead listing a series of experiences it would like its students to have. There are other distinctive features: Shimer provides for early entrance, Raymond a 3-3-3 program (three courses per semester, three semesters per year, three years for graduation), N.I.S. intends to train teachers by giving them a very broadly-based liberal arts education.

What kinds of students are attracted to these schools. Based on samplings from 1966, the following figures were given by Dr. Henry:

Father's Education (%)

Education	Shimer	Raymond	N.I.S.
High School or less	20	20	72
Some College & B.A.	35	36	18
Graduate Work	42	41	5

Family Religious Affiliation

Affiliation	Shimer	Raymond	N.I.S.
Jewish	16	1	10
Protestant	42	60	24
Catholic	17	8	59

Father's Political Affiliation

Affiliation	Shimer	Raymond	N.I.S.
Republican	31	48	24
Democrat	38	28	51
Independent	31	11	16

In each case, Shimer shows more diversity--a more balanced grouping, with the other two schools heavier on one end or the other.

Students at these schools were asked to describe themselves as they had been in high school, the researchers interested in what they thought of themselves there.

Perception of Self in High School

Perception	Shimer	Raymond	N.I.S.
Introspective	16	17	3
Critical of Accepted Values	16	25	11
Independent in Thought and Action	25	28	17
Relatively Happy and Content	10	18	52

High School Peer Groups

Group	Shimer	Raymond	N.I.S.
Interested in academic work	15	39	33
Artistic interest	20	14	7
Bohemian, off-beat	12	2	1
Interest in political activities	0	1	1

Influence on Choice of College

Influence	Shimer	Raymond	N.I.S.
Parent	16	16	27
High School Teacher or Counsellor	3	17	16
College Catalogue or Mass Media	34	23	16

Educational Goals

Goal	Shimer	Raymond	N.I.S.
Mastering Techniques	14	24	55
Developing Critical Thinking	52	49	21
Broad General Outlook	22	26	13

Further, 47% of the Shimer students hesitated before going there (for a variety of reasons), 60% of the Raymond students (23% of those because of academic pressure), 23% of the N.I.S. students. With regard to whether the college had distinctive qualities, the figures were Shimer, 89% yes; Raymond, 97% yes; N.I.S., 36% yes (better than some schools, which drop as low as 10%).

Dr. Henry's report ended with a series of questions from the audience, which focused on the means by which the data were arrived at. (She replied that it was the Personality Omnibus Inventory, developed by her colleague, Paul Heist.) There were also questions addressed to the interpretation of the data.

A CLIMATE OF LEARNING: CASE STUDY OF MONTEITH COLLEGE

Sally W. Cassidy

Monteith College has now graduated four classes, Dr. Cassidy began, and her address would focus on the question of whether it was possible to repeat the endeavor, so as to achieve similar results after the Hawthorne effect was no longer operable. In other words, what happens when the newness and the challenge of survival have passed? Part of Monteith's problem is increased student enrollment without comensurate increases in faculty, this in a situation where each teacher has continuing responsibilities to students, whether they are in his class or not, and irrespective of how long before he may have had them in class.

Two instruments were used to determine the extent to which change had occurred--with the class of 1959 and the class of 1964 as subjects. The first, College Characteristics Index, tries to measure ways of handling students, ways in which knowledge is organized, the atmosphere of the college, etc. The other instrument attempts to get information about faculty accessibility. The results of these two measurements were that, both in over-all terms and in terms of individual items, there was no significant difference between the two classes.

The second instrument is a chart, by means of which each students lists (by drawing lines of contact) the people (relatives, peers, faculty, advisors, secretaries, etc.) with whom he has had any relationship in a given week. He is then asked how many of these he would judge to be personal contacts. The charts for the two groups (1959 and 1964) reveal no significant difference. Dr. Cassidy noted that she had assumed a need for more faculty members, to maintain the very important contact with growing numbers of students, but the results indicate that "at least the perceived contact is very similar." This would suggest that Monteith "has been able to maintain a certain definition of the situation," with regard to handling students, respecting ideas,

etc.--and at the same time has maintained the contact which Monteith considers basic to its endeavors.

She then went on to describe Monteith's methods. First, Ph.D.'s are used with freshmen--not merely in lectures, but also in discussion sections. This is "terribly expensive," and so attempts were made to discover if it "paid off." The important word in this context is salience, over which a college has control, which it uses to insure that the abilities, interests, etc. of each faculty member are accommodated. Most of the staff give lectures (with colleagues in the audience) and lead discussion sections--what might be called "official, required salience." In addition, there is a more voluntary salience, when the teacher gives his own particular course--something he really wants to teach. Or, he may advise a student who wants to do a senior project in a subject of special interest to both of them. Or act as advisor-in-the-background to a seminar conducted by students.

But in addition to this course-work salience, there is a broad area of "unofficial salience," having to do with direct, personal relationships between faculty and students--conversation, coffee discussions, bull sessions, visits to teacher's homes, etc.

Another set of data exists, Dr. Cassidy said, which indicates student responses to questions such as "Do you feel you have made friends with anyone on the faculty?" "Was anyone on the faculty 'meaningful' to you?" "Who among these was 'most meaningful'?" "How often and in what kinds of situations do you see him?" "Who on the Monteith faculty have you had the most contact with?"

This data indicates that the best lecturer is not necessarily the best discussion leader, but the man who gives no lectures is "very, very under-chosen in other roles"--"meaningful," "friend," etc. But on another issue--"Was there anybody on the faculty some of whose qualities you would like to have?"--it was discovered that the lecture platform was sufficient in itself for a professor to be chosen as "model."

In addition, and Dr. Cassidy thought this extremely important, it was found that using Ph.D.'s in the discussion sections was vital. "Seven out of eight of those [professors] considered 'most meaning-

ful' were met in basic discussion session," and--even more surprising--"one of every three was met in the first semester--what I suspect most of us would be inclined to think of as a 'throw-away' semester." It was at that very early point that many students made up their minds about some very important things. By the end of the first year, one in two had met his "most meaningful" person, and only one in fifty after the second year. This kind of fact--that a student picks as "most meaningful" a man with whom he may have had little or no contact for four years--deserves careful examination.

It was significant, Dr. Cassidy said, that those hired on a "mercenary" basis--to fill gaps, with no suggestion of permanence--were "invisible." This, she thought, spoke to the situation and effectiveness of the average graduate assistant. The temporary man, she said, might as well have worn a sign: "It's not worth it, fellows. Not me."

(Miss Cassidy went on to give figures and interpretations having to do with "faculty entrepreneur" classes, senior projects, non-temporary teachers who were "invisible," the kinds of contacts made by students with "invisible" professors, etc.)

Moving to "unofficial" salience, Dr. Cassidy noted that two-thirds of the students tested saw "accessibility" as a characteristic of Monteith faculty, and that there was a close connection between "Who do you have most contact with?" and "friend" or "meaningful person." The kind of accessibility was measured (the conclusion drawn from results being that "informality seems to be very highly related to being chosen as 'meaningful' or 'model'"), as was the number of contacts.

In closing, Dr. Cassidy noted that Monteith students seem less likely than students at some other colleges to respond to value questions with college-catalogue answers. They are likely to value in professors things like "sets at ease," "encourages self-discovery," "is stimulating rather than demanding," "leads to independence rather than discipleship." To a considerable extent, she believes, this results from using experienced, superior teachers with freshmen, and encouraging extensive personal contact between faculty and students.

LEARNING FOR MASTERY

Benjamin Bloom

There is a correlation, Dr. Bloom said, between the extent to which people in a society are educated and the degree to which the economy of that society can utilize educated people. Some societies must select rigorously (the Netherlands, for example, must exclude 92% of its youth from completion of secondary education). Studies show, however, that "investment in humans pays off at a greater rate than does capital investment," suggesting that "highly developed nations no longer operate on the assumption that advanced education is for the few," that "they must find ways to increase the proportion of the age group that can successfully complete both secondary and higher education."

There is another sense in which this is important, however, said Bloom: that is "the intellectual and personality consequences of lack of clear success in the learning tasks of the school." If learning in school is frustrating, it will be difficult to do much at later levels to create interest in learning. Further, in our secular society, "the values for the individual have to do with hedonistic values, inter-personal relations, self-development, and ideas." If the student cannot work successfully in the last two areas, he has only the first two available to him, and the loss of "successful learning experiences in the realm of ideas and self-development" would be serious.

Bloom believes that probably one-fourth of the students in our schools have successful learning experiences; but the schools should be aiming at ninety percent--and this will require changes "in teaching strategies and in the role of evaluation." One important change has to do with the normal grading curve, which for so long has been used to detect difference among learners, though "the differences are trivial in terms of the subject matter." Grades are then distributed in percentages, ten to twelve percent "A's," and so forth--including, possibly, ten to twelve percent failures. We become accustomed to

dividing students into five categories of performance, and seem not concerned that they function relatively --from year to year, from school to school.

One of the results of this is that "we convince students that they can only do 'C' or 'D' work, while at the same time we teach as though only the 'A' and 'B' students should be able to learn what we have to teach." This ignores the great variations among learners, and our basic task is to find strategies which will take these differences into account in a way that will promote the fullest development of the individual.

Bloom's concern "is for a strategy of teaching and learning which will bring all, or almost all students, to a level of mastery in the learning of most subjects," and this concern includes "the affective consequences of such mastery."

One of Bloom's central theses is that "for approximately ninety percent of the students, aptitude is an index of the rate at which they can learn the particular subject. Some may take much more time than others, but all can learn it to some level of mastery." One way of reducing the time required for learning is to create more efficient learning conditions. A second hypothesis is that "the aptitude for a particular learning task may be modified by appropriate learning experiences." Aptitude, in short, is not "a God-given gift," but something that can be developed and altered. (One finding is that with the attainment of mastery, or some degree of it, perseverence increases; another is that as learning conditions become more efficient, the level of perseverence required is markedly decreased.)

To aptitude and perseverence, Bloom would add "the ability to understand instructions," which usually places a premium on verbal ability, even in courses such as mathematics. As instruction (not the ideas, but the instruction itself) becomes more complex and abstract: 1) higher levels of ability are required to understand it; 2) a variety of learning materials and methods may reduce the level of ability required to understand instructions; 3) the use of small steps and frequent feedback in instruction may also reduce the level of ability required to understand instructions. (In short,

students with high verbal ability are able to "get" the material despite bad instructions; students with low verbal ability are not able to get it.)

With respect to the time allowed for the student to learn, Bloom noted that the pace in the classroom is too fast for some students, too slow for others. Thus there is considerable variation in the amount of time students spend learning outside of class. But, "if students complete learning tasks in different calendar times, the achievement of mastery by the slower learners does not have positive affective consequences."

Bloom then turned to some of the work that he and his colleagues have been doing, handing out a chart which described "A Strategy for Mastery Learning." Following is a duplication of that chart:

I. Pre-Conditions:

1. Specification of Content and Objectives of Instruction: Determines the nature of formative and summative evaluations and informs students about course expectations.

2. Standards of Mastery: Criterion performance determined in advance by instructors--especially for mastery (e.g., performance for grade of A may be set on a previous examination and then equated with current achievement examination). This sets grades in terms of performance rather than relative ranking of students and helps students view learning as a cooperative rather than competitive enterprise.

3. Instruction: Ideally a course should be taught by the same instructors as previously and by the same procedures. Thus instructors do not have to learn a new method or approach to teaching.

II. Operating Procedures:

4. Diagnostic Progress Tests (Formative Evaluation): Construction of short tests to cover each unit of instruction. Each test should be scored to indicate mastery and identify sources of difficulty which need to be overcome. These tests should not be

used for grading students. This paces student learning, reassures students who have attained mastery, and identifies further work to be done by students who have not.

5. Prescriptions of Additional Learning: On the basis of the diagnostic progress tests and, if possible, aptitude tests, each student is informed of the additional learning needed to reach mastery. Ideally, the prescription should indicate the sources of each student's difficulty and the steps which should be taken by him. Occasionally, the prescription will suggest the mode for further learning as well as the content. The additional learning should be completed apart from regular group instructions.

6. Alternative Learning Resources: Where the student has not learned a particular set of ideas under the regular instruction, alternative procedures should be prescribed, such as: reread particular materials, read or study alternative materials, use a specific workbook or programmed text, use selected audio-visual presentations, use computer-assisted instruction, review material with two or three other students, obtain tutorial instruction.

III. Outcomes:

7. Achievement Criterion (Summative Evaluation): The final certifying examination(s) should be constructed to appraise student competence with regard to content and objectives of instruction. The standards should be set in advance.

8. Affective Consequences of Mastery: One may expect greater interest in the subject field as the student receives evidence of mastery. If mastery is developed in several fields one may expect greater interest in and more favorable attitudes toward school learning. Although difficult to detect, one may also expect positive changes in self-concept.

9. Quality Control: In a repetition of the strategy in the same subject in later years, equal or higher percents of students should achieve mastery. In succeeding years, the same set of diagnostic progress tests may be used not only for diagnostic purposes but also for quality control checks to insure that appropriate levels of mastery are being achieved.

Though difficulties still exist--especially since different students have such greatly different needs--Bloom believes that "mastery of a learning task or subject is theoretically available to all, not just a few," despite the fact that he and his colleagues have produced mastery in only 80% of their students. "Our problem is what additional resources, what additional materials, what additional supports do the students need to get."

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED

James M. Redfield

Dr. Redfield noted that he was teamed on the program with Harris Wofford, a pairing that might work out well, since Wofford represented a progressive point of view and wanted to create something which needs to exist, whereas the Redfield's desire was "to hold onto something which, in my view, is in danger of disappearance." Paradoxically, the conservative today has to be innovative, if he is going to keep something going in a world of constant change. That, he said, was what the New Collegiate Division at the University of Chicago was all about, operating on the premise that one must ask "what was really important about what we did before, in order to do it again in a new way against this new landscape on which we find ourselves."

In addition, Redfield said, the conservative must be realistic, since what he wants to create requires an exact knowledge of the world he lives in--knowledge which only history can give us. His remarks, therefore, would arise from two questions: What is the essence of the enterprise we call Liberal Education? What is the history of the situation in which that enterprise now finds itself? and would be based on what Redfield knows of the College of the University of Chicago.

The College has always been "something of a poor relation" at the University (itself a center of undergraduate innovation), but has long been "noisy, embattled, and self-righteous." The College exists, as do other elements of the University, to further the University's purpose, which President Beadle said in his report this year was "to set a high standard of intellectual excellence and innovation." What, wondered Redfield, is the good of such a standard; what justifies the great expense of maintaining the University?

For one thing, it is useful in many ways--in science, technology, social science, the arts. It helps prepare young people for a variety of

middle-class occupations. But it does none of these very efficiently, for the first group of purposes are met by various commercial institutions, and the last--teaching--takes the least of its energies. But the University, Redfield, suggested, "is not intended to be useful;" it is a "luxury" that survives because "it is important to all of us that the pursuit of learning go on." It makes possible Aristotle's ideal of "theoretical activity"--contemplation--a fragile human good; and maintaining the contemplative life is the conservative purpose of the university.

This, Redfield pointed out, was an essentially aristocratic position; the tradition of the universities has always been aristocratic. "We have yet to come to terms . . . with the problem of maintaining the university in a democratic society." Indeed, he said, today "the academic life has become one of those careers open to the talents by which young men of no fortune make their way to security . . . ." In effect, "the life of the mind has been converted into one of the forms of the practical life." Add to this the fact that America is a democracy created by puritans, and we have a fuller picture of the American academic, who "works hard" to make his way up the ladder and consequently has little of the leisure for the "theoretical activity" which Aristotle found so important.

This may be better than what happened in, say, the 18th century (where academic life was "not so much leisurely as idle"), but we must be concerned that the seriousness of the modern university does not descend into "hollow, self-important expertise." If it is to serve "its conservative purpose," that purpose must be rediscovered in the new situation which exists: higher education the nation's leading growth industry, a seller's market for faculty, great mobility of faculty talent (which reduces loyalty to the institution), advancement within the disciplines rather than within the schools--in short, a dmoninant professionalism. Because of this, "competence" is valued more than spirit and breadth, and as men are hired for this competence they take their place in the university, tightening the "spiral of professionalism."

Using the difference between rhetoric (concerned with function in time, its discourse a way of

solving problems) and dialectic (discourse for its own sake; a way of living well), Redfield noted that rhetoric has come to be more and more important in the universities, narrowing the opportunities for amateurs and dilettantes (in the good sense of the words) to teach, creating in the democratic college an "increasingly industrialized" curriculum. Even in this structure, however, teachers will use the dialectic (Socratic) method in their classrooms, particularly in general education courses--here making dialectic "practical," in the sense that the enemies of Socrates attacked it as appropriate only in "reasonable" amounts for educating youths.

Our adolescents, Redfield said, "are the aristocrats of the democracy," protected from practical concerns by what Paul Goodman calls the "moratorium" --the pause between high school and professional education--and those favoring the dialectical tradition find themselves fighting for more time during that three or four year moratorium. This struggle may be seen in Hutchins' "solution to the problem of liberal education," which resulted in the College developing "a coherent program of liberal education," of which the speaker himself is a product. It was a good college, but failed in becoming "an effective part of the wider university community," and after Hutchins left it was again taken over (and apart) by that wider community.

This was probably a good thing, Redfield stated, because the separation had been bad: College faculty had lower status, higher teaching loads, lower salaries - were "walled-off from the University;" the graduate faculty, separated from teaching undergraduates, were free to feel that "they had no intellectual responsibilities beyond competence in their specialities." This isolating of the liberal educators among the undergraduates "condemned the enterprise of liberal education to a perpetual adolescence," perpetually "starting again at the beginning."

In fact, the College professor and the graduate professor need each other's virtues if they are not to become confirmed in the weaknesses natural to their situation: the undergraduate teacher finds it easy to get by on his charm and his capacity to "win" against undergraduates; the graduate teacher "easily becomes self-protective and arid."

The merging of the College with the University (in 1952) has not solved the problems, however; instead it led to fifteen years of "sterile controversy," usually between advocates of general education and advocates of specialized education. Today a new solution is being tested (largely the work of Edward Levi): four Collegiate Divisions, each corresponding to a graduate division (Physical Sciences, Biological Sciences, Social Sciences, Humanities), and a New Collegiate Division, which corresponds to nothing. Having inherited no past programs or personnel, and representing no subject-area, "it is free to attack, with a minimum of preconceptions, the problems of undergraduate education in a great graduate university."

The New Division has students, administration budget, but no faculty of its own. Its faculty "self-selects" itself from the University. Having its own budget gives the New Division some voice in hiring, and it thus becomes "an important tool for cracking the tightening spiral" of professionalism. In line with this, Redfield pointed out that it is developing "new subject-matters, new styles of teaching, new ways of involving the graduate students and intellectuals outside the university in the undergraduate school." But the New Division "represents the classical tradition of undergraduate education. That tradition holds that a university is a kind of community, devoted to the pursuit of learning."

If we assume that we are moving in the direction of university experience for every young person, Redfield stated, we might assume that this "classical tradition" is of value to everyone. Such is not the case: "the ineffective irresponsible exploration of theoretical questions is not an activity which suits everyone." But if we are going to give everyone a B.A. we are going to have to attach to it "all the kinds of education the varieties of humanity require," rather than "trying to do everything at the same time in the same place." We need at least four kinds of colleges, each dealing with a different kind of knowledge--technical, political, poetic, philosophical. "I myself would like to hang on to the philosophical . . . . But this classical tradition can survive in the democracy only as other men, like Mr. Wofford, find other ways of doing other things."

DO GROWNUPS LIE?

Harris Wofford, Jr.

Dr. Wofford expressed concern over the increasing prevalence of educational innovation, "like the poor people's industry with all kinds of new careers emerging that depend on poverty." At the same time he was alarmed at becoming a consultant, for it is easy to list the innovations needed, but very difficult to do what is needed.

He then referred to the draft "Plan of Action" that had been prepared for their new college, which Chancellor Gould wants to be one of the most experimental in the country; a friend of his who had seen the draft reminded him of some words they had once spotted scrawled half-way down a high cliff which, when they had with difficulty gotten close enough to read it, said, "Do Grownups Lie?" This, the friend said, is what the younger generation is writing "on every rusty space." Only if we do what this conference has been talking about, said Wofford, will young people conclude that we do not lie.

The first major point Wofford raised was that there is "a larger climate of learning, a national and world climate, which affects all our other little climates of learning," and "if we don't want to be caught lying," or "just lying down", we must now respond to the danger facing the whole climate of learning in this country. We must respond, for example, to the conditions of dissent with regard to Vietnam, defending those who object to our policy there not only because of their right to dissent but because of the need a self-governing nation has to hear things relevant to its self-government. "Here our interest in our local climates of learning converges with our national interest in making America what it promised to be," a land governed by reflection and choice.

Wofford then cited what a protesting Peace Corps volunteer had told him--that as a college president he wouldn't sign such a letter, or demonstrate, or take any controversial stand. Indeed,

the volunteer wondered, "How many college presidents or vice presidents or deans or administrators [and Wofford added 'educational innovators'] have you heard speaking up on public matters of immediate importance and controversy?" Wofford expressed the hope that the student was wrong and that educators--irrespective of the side they took--would join in and encourage debate.

Another area of concern is the matter of drugs, which may lead to a crisis--"a conflict of generations that can tear our campuses apart." Today more and more students (and not just the hippies) and faculty are violating drug laws in the same way they did the prohibition laws in the 1920's--but with one important difference: judges today do not wink at such violations, as they might have during Prohibition, and "make no distinction between dangerous and addictive narcotics like heroin and the apparently non-addictive marijuana." What will happen to the climate of learning, Wofford asked, when police raid campuses, when spy networks develop, when the "under-30 generation concludes that grownups do lie?" Certainly there is the occasion for a lot of learning in the questions this issue produces.

This is not to say, Wofford asserted, that he was suggesting that students be encouraged to break laws, despite the fact that widespread secret disobedience sometimes rendered them null and void (as in sexual practices). "The law against marijuana is not inherently unenforceable and it will not soon fade away." What is at stake is the integrity of grownups. The question must be followed to where it leads, "and if it leads to the conclusion that the law should be changed, we have the responsibility to say so and to begin the public education required." If this is not done--if the facts are denied or not faced--then "we may lose our chance for a real dialogue" with the younger generation on other issues.

This brought Wofford to his main question: "What is the spirit or soul of the educational innovation we need?" He wondered if after we have achieved all our specific innovations there might not be missing the soul, the one vital thing, which for him is "dialogue--the real, mutual, playful, serious, open-ended, Socratic questioning and search without which the Academy is a dead shell, a place for pedants and pupils." This dialogue should rise in the tensions between generations, the older genera-

tion recognizing that it must take part, both in stating its convictions and in listening carefully to what the younger generation has to say. At Old Westbury they are called upon by their Master Plan to do this, to "admit students to full partnership in the academic world."

At present, in the planning stages, this ideal led to the use of students on the planning staff, which has produced "lively and instructive" dialogue. This includes a weekly seminar ("Ideas of the World") which has discussed Antigone, listened to poetry reading and records in the dark, and has ahead seminars on law and on Bobby Dylan and McLuhan. High school editors are being used to start a network of high school planning seminars for the new college, to use students to identify faults and suggest reforms.

But the dialogue occurs also in cross-cultural concerns--in going out into the world and experiencing the variety of its rapidly-changing cultures. This will be a major facet of their curriculum, Wofford said; they will try a plan already approved for Brockport, which leads to a six-year "Peace Corps Master's Degree," as well as other plans, including work in VISTA, on a kibbutz, etc.

At the same time, Wofford and his fellow planners are concerned that the "on-campus intellectual pole is just as high and powerful," and to keep it attractive and relevant they are thinking of bringing in law, medicine, and theology as major themes of undergraduate study, in addition to teaching. These professions require intellectual rigor and skill, and subsume many significant questions: "a doubtful student saw the point about medicine, law and theology when he said the subjects he wanted to study were disease, crime and heresy." Wofford pointed out, however, that this is just one "working hypothesis," which does not exclude other studies. Nor should it suggest that they are designing only one curriculum; indeed, they hope to extend the period of innovation, to make education "a permanent Hawthorne experiment," with development of "a college of colleges" in which students would choose the college with the curriculum that most appealed to them while still being able to profit from the resources of the other colleges.

Wofford expressed confidence that on the whole their experiment would succeed; in fact, he was more concerned that they might succeed too easily--"win the game of educational innovation, but lose, or still lack, the soul of liberal education." In line with this--with his opinion that "the soul of American education has been going through dull, gray years"--Wofford wondered where Socrates (who was seldom in a classroom, was not concerned with future Ph.D.'s) is today. Perhaps among poets and artists, perhaps in the professions his new school will be focussing on, perhaps in the student generation itself. Students more and more seem sensitive to irrelevance, hypocrisy, lies, their own lack of knowledge. (Unfortunately there is mixed in with this "an un-Socratic sense of incompetence and impotence.") But it may be that in the determination of the younger generation to know itself, in its willingness to take risks, "may be the occasion for the emergence of the Socratic citizens a Republic of Learning needs," and if this is true, it presents the colleges, which work with those students, with a great opportunity.

THE STUDENTS AND INSTITUTIONAL CLIMATE

For this session, all of the students present at the conference sat in chairs drawn in a circle, facing inward, with other conference participants seated outside that circle at their backs. The rapid give-and-take of the discussion is difficult to summarize, equally difficult to capture in full.

During the first two days, the students had spent considerable time--in large groups and small--discussing this session, themselves, their views of education, their fears, etc. There was in the room some air of expectation, for many of the non-students were aware of the conversations that had been going on. The session opened with one student making a statement in which he explained their absence from some conference activities as resulting from their preparations for their own session. He said that they felt that what they had done was right, that they were in what they felt was a good learning climate, and that they hoped to share this with the rest of the conferees.

He told the group that quite a few of the students were nervous because they felt they were going to be judged in some manner--ironic perhaps--but true. They would therefore begin by playing a song to give an idea of how students today are aware of their environment--perhaps more than students in years past--since it was not "noise," but something being said that meant something to them. Following this, the students would try to "feed back" to the audience what they had been discussing and then invite all to join the discussion. The song was played, "Ruby Tuesday." After this, the students spoke about what it said to them, the comments hard to follow because of the seating arrangement. The discussion began to break loose from the initial tension, with comments about the song's implications, about the conference, about the "generation gap," about growth and learning, about the desire for status as "young adults," about the need to form an identity, about intense

relationships, about the need to deal with others as people rather than as faculty or administrators or whatever, about honesty, communication, the acceptance of sex, drugs--but always and basically about the intense difficulty of this particular confrontation --be it political, emotional, or something else. After a while a faculty member broke in and the discussion then opened to include others--a discussion so fluid and multi-leveled as to be impossible to do justice to here.

WORKSHOP #1

SMALL RESIDENTIAL COLLEGES

QUESTIONS:

1. What is innovation? just a change? something new?

2. Has the "power" of students (relative to that of faculty and administration) declined?

3. Is a large proportion (1/4) of faculty insulated from innovation?

4. What is the quality of innovation in small colleges?

Out of the questions came no answers satisfactory to the whole group. But more questions arose from discussion:

1. Is a definition of innovation determined by the goals of the new program?

   a. Do we desire to reach the same ends through different means?

   b. Are we training the "whole man" for his place in society?

   c. Is a college class not a task-oriented situation?

   d. Do we not, at times, over-emphasize the student assessment of the academic program? Could this not be just a local malady?

2. Is a definition of innovation determined by the process of the new program?

   a. Must we not emphasize the individual, since freedom and flexibility are two of the advantages peculiar to small colleges?

   b. Who is qualified to set the goals of a society?

c. Since there is a difference between education and therapy, and since in education we assume the initiative and responsibility of the student, can we not present options without preaching doctrine?

d. Is innovation not carried on through the philosophical feedback which is not itself the goal, but part of the process?

3. Have students lost power?

a. Are not faculty members leading guided discussions rather than participating in seminars?

b. Do students not gather around a "power" and identify with it rather than assuming it themselves?

c. Are faculties unreceptive to student unrest because they do not interpret it on a "real" level?

d. Although students desire a place in the decision-making process of their college, do they not shirk the responsibility of making decisions?

e. Have students not let power slip away to faculty and administration for fear of reprisal from evaluators and keepers of the keys?

f. Have students just shifted their power from such institutions as fraternities and sororities to a political model more in line with their contemporary interests?

* * * *

ASIDES:

1. Money is more available to large than small colleges, and therefore the ability of small colleges to innovate is decreased.

2. Small colleges must make themselves known and demonstrate their necessity.

3. Students identify more with administration than with faculty because administrators are more liberal and able to effect change.

Afternoon session:

The innovative process: When dissatisfaction exists, should not a group seek, through innovation, some remedies for needs, even though only a calculated "guess" may be available to proceed with? Some colleges have opportunities to undertake such efforts. Evaluation may reveal success or failure. Experimentation is good. Education is both a science and an art, and innovation is appropriate to both.

How to restructure large group learning in small groups? How does a student understand the task of higher education?--To leave students alone with tapes, books, etc.--to "leave things be"? To redefine a viable culture which is meaningful--a way and a set of relationships? Innovation, best conceived, would be to begin all over again with a group of "fellows" who must discover for themselves answers to their own problems of who they are, how to relate significantly, how to articulate. This articulation is to be validated through an ability to survive.

Would there be a place in this scheme of "beginning again" for many different kinds of "colleges"? What works for one group of individuals may not work for all.

Elaboration of this existentialist position of the student identified the common humanity of faculty and student as a basis for shared activity--a "Striving for coherence."

Would this selection of "fellows" be similar to the "old time religion?" Definite similarities exist. Knowledge is intuitive, personal, intimate, immediate--and these would be the basis for selection and inclusion in the fellowship of the "Saints."

Could it be inferred that the faculty and administration of colleges are trying too hard to do things to and for the students? Only in the sense that established college is not "valid" for a considerable number of today's students, though it may be right for some.

How long is the "college" relevant? As long as growth is apparent or a greater relative growth than that possible elsewhere.

(Much of the afternoon session was question and answer between the discussants and a student, Gary Leach. "Answers to the questions are the answers he thought through with the group.")

WORKSHOP #2

THE SMALL RESIDENTIAL COLLEGE

Following self-introductions, the group conducted an inventory of the concerns and interests of the participants. Among the items mentioned were the following:

--Is the existentialist-essentialist dichotomy (from the keynote address) an effective way of responding to the real problems at hand? Should we not be giving attention to the practical questions of implementation which follow the decision to innovate?

--What reactions are there to the distinction between evolution and revolution in an institution? Is revolution, as more easily possible in a smaller institution, of greater significance there? (Response included the observation that the effect of change can extend to the entire institution if it is small, and a consensus that the distinction is not very significant in the long run.)

--Is there danger that innovation in a small college will focus exclusively on curriculum and program, ignoring such other dimensions as improving or varying instructional techniques?

--Do faculty members in a small college sometimes look upon their work as a "job" only, so as to be only partly professional but also partly "blue-collar" in their attitudes?

--Is faculty stability, or commitment to the institution, especially important in the small college for continuity in innovation and the survival of innovation, simply because the influence of one person on innovation can be so great? What kind of faculty member is needed?

--What is the role of innovation in the small college? (Response included setting the distinctive style of the institution and capitalizing on the opportunity, present in small colleges but not always utilized, for intimate personal relationships.)

Questions were raised in this context regarding the ends of innovation, the need to deal in terms of behavioral characteristics of students (such as a move from dependence to independence) and the necessity of distinguishing among different types of students in attempting to identify desirable behavioral changes. The climate of learning must vary for different kinds of students. The more and more sophisticated study of student characteristics and institutional climates has the danger of leading to an overly-homogeneous student population. A crucial kind of student is the one who wishes to figure out ways to change "the system" (not, however, just any change, such as a change from quality to mediocrity).

How, it was asked, do innovative colleges develop? One source lies in the application of a creative idea from another place which was not able to apply it effectively (e.g., Shimer in its relationship to Chicago). Another is sheer financial need and pressure (e.g., in Goddard's history). Innovation often involves coming up with more interesting and creative solutions to rather mundane problems; the kind of person needed is the one who can do this. Innovation is not merely doing what others are not doing, but rather doing something which others are overlooking because they are so involved in an ongoing process that they cannot try to change anything without changing the totality, and this cannot be done easily.

(End of morning session. It was decided that the afternoon would be used for presentation of a current issue at Roger Williams College, and reaction to and analysis of this situation in a kind of case-study approach.)

At the beginning of the afternoon discussion session, Ralph Gauvey (President, Roger Williams) described the background, the plans for change to a four-year program, and the proposed new curriculum for Roger Williams. Serious financial problems regarding the proposed site of a new campus have arisen. One possible direction being considered involves a move by one unit of the college, for a limited time, into a building in a housing project, a building which has been closed because of vandalism and related difficulties. The setting would be used as a kind of

laboratory for a study of social welfare, finding out what happened there, etc. Many questions came up: would new students, rather than present students, be recruited for such a project? How would "academic standing and respectability" be maintained? What faculty members would go there? (Details of these descriptions are omitted for brevity--from the notes)

Out of extensive discussion of this situation, various generalizations regarding innovation in the small residential college were drawn, most of them widely accepted (but not necessarily universally accepted in the group). Various important questions were raised, not always answered. Included were the following points:

--The idea is great, but how can it be implemented? How do you know that you have enough of a base to make a markedly experimental move? Is there not a danger of proceeding with a good idea and finding that you have no faculty and no students going with you? Aren't we often afraid to say honestly that an idea (even a good one) will not work in a given situation?

--The practical problems of implementation are in a most important and often insufficiently considered dimension. There are plenty of great ideas for innovation; the real key is in having the right people at the right time to put them into practice.

--Do teachers "back home" become frightened of some creative ideas and moves? How does one deal with this? It seems important to prove to faculty members that they are "valued," that they will be "taken care of." This makes it possible for them to be experimental.

--We talk frequently about recruiting innovative faculty. What can we do with the people we already have, since it is not possible or desirable to recruit a whole new faculty for innovation? There is a great need for more study of motivation and of other ways to provide satisfaction to teachers.

--If the concept of satisfaction is explored more, security, as ordinarily understood, might become less important.

--Does not the small college sometimes serve as a "haven" for faculty members who want security? Security is often provided by status in a hierarchy? Could efforts not be made to provide security in other ways, making people feel valued as and because they experiment? This would seem to be a genuinely innovative "climate of learning"--as exemplified at Goddard.

WORKSHOP #3

URBAN COMMUTER COLLEGES

Introductory Note:

It was early decided that the word "College" should be changed to "Institution" to include problems of both the large city university and the smaller commuter college.

I. The Urban Commuter Student and his Culture

Two questions arose early. 1. What is the urban commuter student really like? 2. Can the urban commuter student population have a student culture?

With reference to the first question, it was agreed that in some respects the urban commuter students are a highly heterogeneous group. For example, their ethnic background and their social and political attitudes. On the other hand, they can be seen as a very homogeneous group, particularly with reference to their socio-economic status and their attitudes toward learning and the faculty. It was felt by many that the urban commuter students, much more than the residential college students, carry with them the residue of their high school experiences, especially with respect to their self-responsibility for learning.

The question relative to the existence of an urban student culture arose from the speech of Joseph Gusfield. Some of the participants felt that there was no urban commuter student culture at their institutions. Most of the group felt that such a culture did exist, but there was some disagreement as to the nature of that culture, or the strength of it.

It was agreed that in addition to the college and family experiences which are important in urban student life, for most of these young people a work experience was a third area of significance. It was generally felt that urban institutions could make much more educational value of these work experiences than has been done so far.

After giving considerable consideration to the more apathetic students who look upon their college years as merely a means to gain economic security in the future and who seem lacking in the usual college community sentiment of the residential institution, the group then turned its attention to that portion of the commuter college student body, which does have enthusiasm. What factors seem associated with these enthusiastic students? Three factors of potential significance were pointed out. One was a personal commitment to the solution of social problems. A second was the involvement with some sort of home base on the campus. (For example, it was noted that theater groups on urban campuses often display a marked degree of enthusiasm and that these were groups which had a place where they could "hang out." The third factor pointed out was that of enthusiastic faculty members who are willing to give of themselves beyond the classroom. Many of the groups of enthusiastic students had a continuing relationship with a faculty advisor or faculty friend of some sort, with whom they felt a link beyond the formal class experiences.

In conclusion, with respect to urban students and their culture there was general agreement that as of yet we know little about them, and that of our most important tasks is to identify the significant characteristics and the reasons for their existence.

II. The Faculty of the Urban Commuter Institution

The second question to which the group addressed itself was the nature of the faculty which teaches in the urban institution. It was generally felt that as with the student body, one could not assume that the faculty of urban commuter institutions was the same in their attitudes, their backgrounds, their approach toward education as the faculty in the four-year residential institutions. The counterpart of the student who works is the faculty member who moonlights, teaching a full load at his particular institution and teaching additional classes at some other urban commuter institution, such as a junior college. The problem of faculty residence in relation to employment was discussed and generally believed to be a significant aspect. In assessing the general role of faculty in the college life, it was felt that not only do many faculty members not

have satisfactory experiences with young people, but too often they do not have satisfactory experiences within their own group. They do not know themselves. The question arose, should the urban institution concentrate on changing faculty rather than students, under the assumption that success in the former would assure success in the latter? In any case the group was in agreement that an urban institution should know its faculty profile as well as its student profile if it is going to be innovative and experimental in any meaningful way.

III. Frame of Reference for Innovation

What frame of reference is to be used for the innovative process at a commuter school? The danger is in choosing a frame of reference that is not relevant to the institution. As we have seen, the student culture or the faculty profile of a four-year residential college of the traditional sort may not be applicable to the modern urban commuter institution. Even the faculty teaching in the urban commuter institution may approach the problems of innovation from the standpoint of their memories of the "good old undergraduate days" at a four-year residential school--memories that may be highly unrealistic in their present environment. Consider the problem of assessing the time and energy resources of faculty members which can be utilized in innovation. In the light of commuting problems and geographic distance alone, typical discussions of traditional twelve-hour and nine-hour teaching loads have very different meanings. In short, we have hardly scratched the surface in finding new patterns of cooperation and interaction among urban faculty, administration, and students.

IV. Specific Suggestions for Innovation

Three ideas received the particular attention of the group, and the general sense was that these were deserving of much more thought and experimentation.

One of these was based on the recognition that most urban commuter students work during their college career. It was pointed out that a number of our experimental colleges purposely try to involve their students in work experiences prior to

graduation, believing that these have a maturing and educational influence. In most cases this work experience is not concurrent with the academic study, but in some instances it is. For the most part, urban commuter students carry on their academic life and their work life in two separate spheres. Does this not pose the challenge to the college to make educational capital out of this work experience? What sorts of on-going seminars might be carried on with students relative to their work life? In what way might even the more mundane jobs of store clerk or gasoline station operator be related to significant problems in the social sciences, such as unemployment, automation, cybernetics, unionism, and governmental welfare action? We urge that commuter institutions examine carefully this potential.

A second idea which captured the attention of the group was that which might be labeled "commuter house." As was pointed out earlier, certain groups of students such as those engaged in theater, have the advantage of a home base or locale on the college campus. Why should not all students have an opportunity for such a "commuter house," a place where they could leave their belongings, partake of refreshments, and engage in discussions with a group of their friends? The concept of the commuter house is more than one of providing many lounge spaces on the college campus. It is the combination of space and curriculum, of space and population. It would involve a building on the experiments already carried out in a number of colleges whereby a group of students proceeds through their career as a unit interacting with a particular group of faculty as a unit. If such a sub-grouping within the urban college can be provided their own "commuter house" would not the urban college experience be greatly different from that which students now experience? The group was in agreement that lack of meaningful communication is one of the great problems on the commuter campus and that exploration in the area of commuter houses is urgent.

A third suggestion which met with general approval was that which might be termed the "faculty-student retreat" or the "school camp for the commuter college." Recognizing that the commuter college would never be involved in supplying dormitories for its total student body, it was felt that many of

the benefits of the residential experience could be obtained from short-term residential programs. The experience of this conference with students, faculty, and administrators, living, talking, meeting together in a rural setting, forms one model for this idea. Faculty-student retreats form another model, and still another example would be the educational use of camp settings made by public school systems in the programs called "school camping" in which students and teachers participate in a residential learning experience for a period of days. If groups of commuter college faculty, students and administrators could spend a weekend or other short period of time in a residential experience off the main campus, it is thought that many of the problems of communication might be solved. In addition, there would be by-product values, such as that of learning more about the nature of the student body through such an experience.

WORKSHOP #4

THE SMALL COLLEGE IN A LARGE UNIVERSITY

Questions that were discussed:

1. Is the innovative college a "brain drain" on the larger university?

2. Is there an optimum class size for effective learning?

3. How can we evaluate the effectiveness of the college within the University?

4. "Popularized higher education" as described by Gusfield is inevitable. Hence, large institutions are going to be doing most of the educating. Are these large institutions capable of being instruments of innovation?

5. How does a school like Monteith maintain its insularity in the large University setting?

Discussion of innovation in evaluation:

1. New Division at Nasson:

   a. The transcript has a description of the kind of experiences the student has been in contact with. Two letters of evaluation go into the transcript each semester. The student chooses who of his 4 or 5 teachers write these evaluations.

   b. The instructor decides whether the student has background for his course.

   c. One proves he is due for graduation by accumulating courses over a 4-year time span.

2. The ungraded freshman year at Cal Tech.

3. Bard College (and others): students grade themselves; instructor usually wouldn't lower grades, but he might raise them.

4. Ten point rating schedule.

Discussion of what can be done with the freshman year:

1. "Forgiveness feature" of a given number of faculty.

2. Not including final GPA the first two years (University of Missouri).

3. "Permissiveness with proscription"

4. What do we know about "why" students drop out?

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Joseph G. Astman, Dean, Hofstra College of Liberal Arts & Science, Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York

Jerry Bails, Associate Professor, Natural Science Division, Monteith College - Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan

Rosemary S. Bannan, Assistant Professor of Sociology, De Paul University, Chicago, Illinois

Samuel Baskin, President, Union for Research and Experimentation in Higher Education, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio

Harold Berlinger, Faculty, Illinois Teachers College Chicago-North, Chicago, Illinois

Benjamin Bloom, Department of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

Rev. A. James Blumeyer, S.J., Assistant to the Dean of Student Affairs, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri

Stanley Bratman, student, Shimer College, Mount Carroll, Illinois

Rev. Francis Brennan, S.J., Director of the Honor's Program, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri

Vincent Burns, Assistant Professor fo Art, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana

Sally W. Cassidy, Chairmn, Science of Society Division, Monteith College - Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan

Max Coral, Associate Dean, Monteith College - Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan

Denis Cowan, Vice President and Dean of Faculty, Shimer College, Mount Carroll, Illinois

K. Patricia Cross, Conference Coordinator, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, California

Albert J. Delmez, Professor of Languages, Stephens College, Columbia, Missouri

James Dickinson, Instructor in Arts & Letters, Nasson College, Springvale, Maine

James P. Dixon, President, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio

Charles Dreilinger, student, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio

Seymour Eskow, President, Rockland Community College, Suffern, N.Y.

Elwin D. Farwell, President, Luther College, Decorah, Iowa

Francis Fay, Faculty, Goddard College. Plainfield, Vermont

Robert Friedman, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio

Lois Gandt, student, Shimer College, Mount Carroll, Illinois

Ralph E. Gauvey, President, Roger Williams Junior College, Providence, Rhode Island

George C. Giles, Assistant Professor, Division of Education, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, Chicago, Illinois

Stanley Goldberg, Assistant Professor of Physical Science, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio

James Green, Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio

Joseph Gusfield, Professor of Sociology, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois

Rev. Robert Hall, Chaplain, Shimer College, Mount Carroll, Illinois

Charles W. Harwood, Dean, Fairhaven College, Western Washington State College, Bellingham, Washington

Mildred Henry, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, California

Robert Hind, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education, Stanford University, Palo Alto, California

Harold Hodgkinson, Dean, Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson, New York

Thomas C. Howard, Associate Professor of Behavioral Science, Nasson College, Springvale, Maine

William Howenstine, Dean, Illinois Teacher College Chicago-North, Chicago, Illinois

Donald H. Hughes, Director of Research and Innovation, Macalester College, St. Paul, Minnesota

Karen Iverson, student, Stephens College, Columbia, Missouri

Arthur Jalove, student, Illinois Teachers College Chicago North, Chicago, Illinois

Lloyd K. Johnson, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

David A. Kamen, Teaching Associate, University of California, Berkeley, California

Frank Kerins, Professor of Philosophy, Loretto Heights College, Denver, Colorado

Brian C. Koleto, Instructor of Physics, Rock Valley College, Rockford, Illinois

Eliezer Krumbein, Associate Professor of Education, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, Chicago, Illinois

Dan Kuzahara, Illinois Teachers College Chicago-North, Chicago, Illinois

Shirley Langer, Instructor in Psychology, Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York

Gary Leach, student, Goddard College, Plainfield, Vermont

William Lienemann, Faculty, Illinois Teachers College Chicago-North, Chicago, Illinois

John V. S. Linnell, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Luther College, Decorah, Iowa

William N. Lovell, Associate Executive Director, Department of Higher Education, National Council of the Churches of Christ, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, New York

D. Eldridge McBride, Chairman, Social Sciences Area, Shimer College, Mount Carroll, Illinois

John McCormick, Assistant to the President, Shimer College, Mount Carroll, Illinois

Noel McInnis, Director, Educational Development, Kendall College, Evanston, Illinois

Richard MacKey, Assistant Professor of History, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana

Sister Patricia Jean Manion, President-elect, Loretto Heights College, Denver, Colorado

Warren Martin, Research Educator, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, California

Jerome E. Maurer, Instructor Psychology, Rock Valley College, Rockford, Illinois

Arthur Messier, Moderator of Town Meeting - New Division (Student Government), Nasson College, Springvale, Maine

Stuart Miller, Assistant Professor, Livingston College - Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey

Ronnie Millman, student, Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York

F. Joseph Mullin, President, Shimer College, Mount Carroll, Illinois

Stanley Newman, Faculty, Illinois Teachers College Chicago-North, Chicago, Illinois

Richard Peterson, Research Psychologist, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey

Lawrence Porter, Associate Professor of Literature, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio

Walter A. Pranger, Jr., Assistant Professor of Mathematics, De Paul University, Chicago, Illinois

Roland Reboussin, Assistant Professor of Psychology, Beloit College, Beloit, Wisconsin

Al Record, United States National Student Association, 2115 S Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

James M. Redfield, Associate Dean of the College, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

Don Robinson (Press), News Bureau, Washington Post, Washington, D.C.

John Saly, ACE Academic Intern, Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York

Leo Segedin, Faculty, Illinois Teachers College Chicago-North, Chicago, Illinois

Kenneth A. Shaw, Assistant to the President, Illinois State University Normal, Illinois

William Sleeper, Associate Professor of Music, Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson, New York

June Sochen, Faculty, Illinois Teachers College Chicago-North, Chicago, Illinois

Charles Stamps, Faculty, Illinois Teachers College Chicago-North, Chicago, Illinois

Terrance Tankersley, student, Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson, New York

Rae Taylor, student, Loretto Heights College, Denver, Colorado

Albert Trobian (Representing Dr. Helen Trobian, Director, Humanities Summer School), Chairman, Humanities Core, Bennett College, Greensboro, North Carolina

Lee Verstandig, Coordinator of Social Sciences, Roger Williams Junior College, Providence, Rhode Island

Alan M. Walker, Dean, Northwood Campus, Goddard College, Plainfield, Vermont

Goodwin Watson, Distinguished Service Professor, Newark State College, and Associate Director for Program Development and Research, Union for Research and Experimentation in Higher Education, Rye, New York (home address)

Charles A. White, Head of Speech Department, Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois

Mrs. Bernice Williamson, Assistant Director of Counseling Services, Stephens College, Columbia, Missouri

R. Eugene Wise, Associate Professor of Social Sciences, Raymound College, University of the Pacific, Stockton, California

John D. Withers, Acting Dean of Faculty and Instruction, Clark College, Atlanta, Georgia

Harris Wofford, President, State University of New York, College at Nassau, Old Westbury, New York

Paul H. Davis, Willamette Towers, 1313 Lincoln Street, Eugene, Oregon